

REMARKSClaim Changes

Claims 1 and 22 have been amended to more clearly recite the claimed invention. Further, claims 1 and 22, as amended, recite "verifying authorization of said CPC to use said configuration data." These changes are based at least on the description on page 10 of the specification, as filed. Thus, no new matter is added.

Claim 18 is amended to incorporate the subject matter of claim 21; claim 21 has been amended to remove the subject matter.

Claim 3 is amended to clarify and simplify the language in light of currently amended claim 1.

Claim 23 is amended to clarify and simplify the language in light of currently amended claim 22.

Claims 11 and 12 have been amended to more clearly recite the claimed invention.

No amendment made is related to the statutory requirements of patentability unless expressly stated herein. No amendment is made for the purpose of narrowing the scope of any claim, unless Applicant had argued herein that such amendment is made to distinguish over a particular reference or combination of references. Any remarks made herein with respect to a given claim or amendment is intended only in the context of that specific claim or amendment, and should not be applied to other claims, amendments, or aspects of Applicant's invention.

Rejection of Claims 1-2, 4, 22, and 24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 7391808 (Farrand) in view of US 7230734 (Hirata).

Applicant has amended the claims to clarify the invention. Applicant therefore respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection of claims 1-2, 4, 22, and 24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Farrand in view of Hirata, as herein amended.

The Office Action on page 3 states "Hirata, in an analogous art dealing with attaching a device (in this case a printer), does disclose downloading a driver for the device via the cable head end. Such a driver, as is known in the art, would allow the STB to access the device (Figure 2, item 211 printer is attached to item 104 receiver; column 12, lines 4-7; Hirata describes downloading a driver for a device)."

Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of Farrand and Hirata does not teach or suggest all the claim limitations as set forth in independent claims 1 and 22, as amended. For example, independent claims 1 and 22 recite (emphasis added) "verifying authorization of said CPC to use said configuration data" which is not taught or suggested in the combination of Farrand and Hirata.

Hirata is directed towards a receiving apparatus comprising a tuner for receiving multiplexed television broadcasts, wherein the receiving apparatus does not require a user's or viewer's time-consuming operation for initial setup or updating of a printer driver. Hirata summary of invention.

Hirata in col. 12, lines 4-7 states "a printer driver file and a set-top box updating file are alternately transmitted, by way of example. In a partial-band broadcasting method 1102, the band of a predetermined channel is divided into a plurality of sub-bands in which different files are multiplexed and broadcasted simultaneously. In the partial-band broadcasting in FIG. 11, a printer driver file and a set-top box upgrading file (or any other file) are multiplexed and broadcasted, by way of example. It does not matter whether the whole-band or partial-band method is used. If it is not necessary to retrieve a set-top box upgrading file when a printer driver is downloaded, the receiver 104 downloads only the printer driver file, and stores it in the HD 208." Therefore, in view of the above citation Hirata in col. 12, lines 4-7 merely describes that the receiver downloads a printer driver file and may also download a set-top box upgrading file. However, Hirata fails to describe or suggest that the receiver verifies whether the receiver is

authorized to use the downloaded printer file. Thus, Hirata fails to describe or suggest “verifying authorization of said CPC to use said configuration data” as recited by independent claims 1 and 22, as amended. Further, Farrand cannot remedy the acknowledged deficiency of Hirata, because Farrand does not describe downloading configuration data to access the upgrade decoder, as admitted by the Office Action on page 3, item 2. Since the combination of Farrand and Hirata fails to disclose Applicant’s claimed invention as claimed in independent claims 1 and 22, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Applicant requests that claims 1 and 22 now be passed to allowance.

Dependent claims 2, 4, and 24 depend from, and include all the limitations of independent claims 1 or 22. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests the reconsideration of dependent claims 2, 4, and 24 and requests withdrawal of the rejection.

Rejection of Claims 3 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 7391808 (Farrand) in view of US 7230734 (Hirata), in further view of US 585490 (Garney)

Dependent claims 3 and 23 depend from, and include all the limitations of independent claims 1 and 22. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests the reconsideration of dependent claims 3 and 23 and requests withdrawal of the rejection.

Rejection of Claims 5-7 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 7391808 (Farrand) in view of US 7230734 (Hirata), in further view of US 20040223738 (Johnson)

Dependent claims 5-7 depend from, and include all the limitations of independent claim 1. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests the reconsideration of dependent claims 5-7 and requests withdrawal of the rejection.

Rejection of Claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 7391808 (Farrand) in view of US 7230734 (Hirata), in further view of US 20040223738 (Johnson) in further view of US 5682195 (Hendricks)

Dependent claim 8 depends from, and includes all the limitations of independent claim 1. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests the reconsideration of dependent claim 8 and requests withdrawal of the rejection.

Rejection of Claims 9-10, 15, and 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 7391808 (Farrand) in view of US 20040223738 (Johnson) in further view of US 5841433(Chaney).

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claims 9-10, 15, and 17. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

The Office Action for “a first interface field programmable gate array (FPGA) communicatively coupled to said demodulator” is missing.

Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of Farrand, Chaney, and Johnson does not teach or suggest all the claim limitations as set forth in independent claim 9, as amended. For example, independent claim 9 recites (emphasis added) “a first interface field programmable gate array (FPGA) communicatively coupled to said demodulator” which is not taught or suggested in the combination of Farrand, Chaney, and Johnson.

Further, the Office Action on page 8 states “Farrand fails to disclose an FPGA that is coupled to the first decoder and demodulator.” Applicant respectfully agrees that Farrand fails to disclose a FPGA communicatively coupled to said demodulator. Moreover, the Johnson reference nowhere discloses “a FPGA communicatively coupled to said decoder.” Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to either show the exact citations or withdraw the rejection. Even though, Johnson in Paragraph [0031] states “FPGA 108 can provide processing instructions for data received from the AN input selector 138 or the USB interface 146, depending on the type of data received. For example, if AN data is received in an uncompressed form, FPGA 108 can forward the A/V data to MPEG encoder/decoder 106 for MPEG compression prior to being sent to the record/playback interface 110. However, if AN data is received in an MPEG

compressed format, FPGA 108 can forward the AN data straight to the receive/playback interface 110. In either case the FPGA 108 can provide read/write instructions to the record/playback interface 110, which then can store the AN data onto storage 148.” But, Johnson fails to describe or suggest “*a first interface field programmable gate array (FPGA) communicatively coupled to said demodulator*” as recited by independent claim 9. Further, Farrand cannot remedy the acknowledged deficiency of Johnson, as admitted by the Office Action. Furthermore, Chaney also fails to remedy the acknowledged deficiency of Johnson.

Since the combination of Farrand, Chaney, and Johnson fails to disclose Applicant’s claimed invention as claimed in independent claim 9, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Applicant requests that claim 9 now be passed to allowance.

Dependent claims 10, 15, and 17 depend from, and include all the limitations of independent claim 9. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests the reconsideration of dependent claims 10, 15, and 17 and requests withdrawal of the rejection.

Rejection of Claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 7391808 (Farrand) in view of US 20040223738 (Johnson) in further view of US 5841433 (Chaney) in further view of US 7230734 (Hirata).

Dependent claim 11 depends from, and includes all the limitations of independent claim 9. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests the reconsideration of dependent claim 11 and requests withdrawal of the rejection.

Rejection of Claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 7391808 (Farrand) in view of US 20040223738 (Johnson) in further view of US 5841433(Chaney) in further view of US 5854905 (Garney).

Dependent claim 12 depends from, and includes all the limitations of independent claim 9. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests the reconsideration of dependent claim 12 and requests withdrawal of the rejection.

Rejection of Claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 7391808 (Farrand) in view of US 20040223738 (Johnson) in further view of US 5841433(Chaney) in further view of US 5851149 (Xidos)

Dependent claim 13 depends from, and includes all the limitations of independent claim 9. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests the reconsideration of dependent claim 13 and requests withdrawal of the rejection.

Rejection of Claim 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 7391808 (Farrand) in view of US 20040223738 (Johnson) in further view of US 5841433(Chaney) in further view of US 6333643 (Kurooka).

Dependent claim 14 depends from, and includes all the limitations of independent claim 9. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests the reconsideration of dependent claim 14 and requests withdrawal of the rejection.

Rejection of Claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 7391808 (Farrand) in view of US 20040223738 (Johnson) in further view of US 5841433(Chaney) in further view of US 5805806 (McArthur).

Dependent claim 16 depends from, and includes all the limitations of independent claim 9. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests the reconsideration of dependent claim 16 and requests withdrawal of the rejection.

Rejection of Claims 18-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 7391808 (Farrand) in view of US 20040223738 (Johnson).

Applicant has amended the claims to clarify the invention. Applicant therefore respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection of claims 18-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Farrand in view of Johnson as herein amended. Particularly claim 18 was amended to incorporate the subject matter of claim 21.

The Office Action on page 16, item 13 states “[w]ith regard to 21... Hendricks describes a method of delivering content in a cable television system. Specifically, he describes encrypting data prior to transmission at the head-end, and decrypting the data at an IRC upon receipt (column 12, line 66 -column 13, line 8; Hendricks specifically discloses a method of encrypting MPEG data prior to transmission and decrypting upon receipt).” Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Office Action regarding the rejection of claim 21.

Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of Farrand, Johnson, and Hendricks does not teach or suggest all the claim limitations as set forth in independent claim 18, as

amended. For example, independent claim 18 recites “an encryption/decryption engine, comprised within the upgrade decoder, configured to locally encrypt and decrypt audio/video signals” which is not taught or suggested in the combination of Farrand, Johnson, and Hendricks.

Hendricks in column 12, line 66 -column 13, line 8 states “The Integrated Receiver Components (IRCs) 118 shown demodulates and unscrambles (if necessary) the received transponder signals which may contain 4, 6, 8, or more audio/video channels of information. The IRC 118 demodulates the transponder signal into a digital bit stream of multiplexed digitized MPEG 2 format video. In an alternative embodiment, descrambling is performed by a separate descrambler. In another alternative embodiment, the multiplexed MPEG signal is encrypted before transmission to the headend 42 and decrypted by the IRC 118.” Therefore, Hendricks merely describes that the multiplexed mpeg is signal is scrambled before transmission to the head end, and descrambled by the IRC or a separate descrambler. However, Hendricks fails to describe or suggest that the multiplexed MPEG signals can be encrypted and decrypted in an encryption/decryption engine, comprised within the IRC118. Thus, Hendricks fails to disclose “an encryption/decryption engine, comprised within the upgrade decoder, configured to locally encrypt and decrypt audio/video signals” as recited by independent claim 18, as amended.

Since the combination of Farrand, Johnson, and Hendricks fails to disclose Applicant’s claimed invention as claimed in independent claim 18, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of claim 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Applicant requests that claim 18 now be passed to allowance.

Dependent claims 19-20 depend from, and include all the limitations of independent claim 18. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests the reconsideration of dependent claims 19-20 and requests withdrawal of the rejection.

Rejection of Claim 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 7391808 (Farrand) in view of US 20040223738 (Johnson) in further view of US 5682195(Hendricks) in further view of US 6333643 (Kurooka).

Dependent claim 21 depends from, and includes all the limitations of independent claim 18. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests the reconsideration of dependent claim 21 and requests withdrawal of the rejection.

Rejection of Claim 25 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 7391808 (Farrand) in view of US 7230734 (Hirata) in further view of US 5682195(Hendricks)

Dependent claim 25 depends from, and includes all the limitations of independent claim 22. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests the reconsideration of dependent claim 25 and requests withdrawal of the rejection.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. Such action is earnestly solicited by the Applicant. Should the Examiner have any questions, comments, or suggestions, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicant's attorney or agent at the telephone number indicated below.

Please charge any fees that may be due to Deposit Account 502117, Motorola, Inc.

Respectfully submitted,
Aaron J. Barber

Date: November 5, 2008

BY: /Stewart M. Wiener/
Stewart M. Wiener
Registration No. 46,201
Attorney for Applicant

MOTOROLA, INC.
101 Tournament Drive
Horsham, PA 19044
Telephone: (215) 323-1811
Fax: (215) 323-1300